

Comments on the proposed suppression of all prior usages of generic and specific names of birds (Aves) by John Gould and others conventionally accepted as published in the *Proceedings of the Zoological Society of London* (Case 3044; see BZN 54: 172–182; 55: 176–185; 56: 274–280)

Murray D. Bruce and Ian A.W. McAllan

P.O. Box 180, Turramurra, New South Wales 2074, Australia

Schodde & Bock (BZN 56: 279–280) have published a reply to our previous comment (BZN 56: 274–279) on their application, and we wish to make a response. Our support of case-by-case analysis of the names involved, which would require only a few proposals to be submitted to the Commission, remains the principal objective of our opposition to Case 3044.

Schodde & Bock refer (their para. 2) to the 'daunting prospect' of 'didactic word games' and 'protracted debates' which would result from our approach, but this is at best misleading and at worst scaremongering. In Case 3044 and subsequently they have made much of the SCON meeting in Vienna in 1994, although this was not a formal meeting but an informal gathering of the few SCON members present in Vienna and a much larger number of non-members. They claim (their final para.) that 'one of us commented to the effect that ... it was up to others to provide solutions'. The implication is that we raised issues and then left others to take the responsibility for solving them. Nothing could be further from the truth. The comment actually referred to the summary of our 1991 paper, in which we noted that submissions to the Commission might be needed in a few instances. Naturally we would not wish to seek the blanket suppression of our own findings which has been proposed by Schodde & Bock, and we continue to oppose Case 3044. It contradicts our opinion that those few issues in our paper which could affect nomenclatural stability should be dealt with on an individual basis; the majority of our findings merely deal with the citation of different sources for names from those given in standard references, and these can be easily absorbed in the ornithological literature.

We wish to refer further to Bonaparte's (1855) name '*Somateria v.-nigrum*' (see our comment in BZN 56: 277, para. 11 and Schodde & Bock's response in BZN 56: 279, 4th para.). Bonaparte's relevant paragraph is divided into two parts, indicated by the author placing three periods between the note on the juvenile specimen and the brief discussion of the specimen at the British Museum. There is no direct connection because Bonaparte discussed two separate items linked only in relating to the same genus of ducks. The new name '*v.-nigrum*' is linked to the British Museum type material only.

Comments on the proposed designation of neotypes for the nominal species *Vespertilio pipistrellus* Schreber, 1774 and *V. pygmaeus* Leach, 1825 (currently *Pipistrellus pipistrellus* and *P. pygmaeus*; Mammalia, Chiroptera)
(Case 3073; see BZN 56: 182–186; 57: 49–50)

Otto von Helversen and Frieder Mayer

Universität Erlangen, Institut für Zoologie II, Staudtstr. 5, D-91058 Erlangen, Germany